

## REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration is requested.

In item 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 21-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner indicated as indefinite the language "when the reception state is bad and ...when the reception state is good" in independent claims 21, 28, and 35.

By this amendment, claims 21, 28, and 35 have been amended to recite that the received packet reception state includes a packet loss ratio and that the priority assignment is performed in such a manner that a number of packets that are high in priority is decreased when the packet loss ratio is larger than a predetermine value and is increased when the packet loss ratio is smaller than the predetermined value. This new language replaces the language which was raised as an issue by the Examiner. It is believed that the amendments to the independent claims 21, 28, and 35 adequately address and overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Also by this amendment, claims 21-24 and 29-31 have been cancelled.

In item 3 of the Office Action, claims 11-20 were allowed.

In view of the above, it is submitted that all of the pending claims 11-21, 25-28, and 32-35 are allowable and that the application is accordingly in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Koichi HATA et al.

By: 

Jeffrey R. Filipek  
Registration No. 41,471  
Attorney for Applicants

JRF/ck  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
August 9, 2005